



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/546,174	04/11/2000	Chih-Chien Liu	IIA 462C1	4793

25235 7590 11-07/2003
HOGAN & HARTSON LLP
ONE TABOR CENTER, SUITE 1500
1200 SEVENTEENTH ST
DENVER, CO 80202

EXAMINER

SERGEANT, RABON A

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

1711

DATE MAILED: 11/07/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

AS

Advisory Action	Application No. 09/546,174	Applicant(s) LIU ET AL.	
	Examiner Rabon Sergeant	Art Unit 1711	

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 04 August 2003 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]

- a) ☐ The period for reply expires _____ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☒ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. **ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).**

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☐ A Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. ☒ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
- (a) ☒ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
 - (b) ☒ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
 - (c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
 - (d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: See Continuation Sheet.

3. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5. ☒ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☒ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.
6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7. ☒ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☒ will not be entered or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:


Claim(s) allowed: _____.

Claim(s) objected to: _____.

Claim(s) rejected: 50-93.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

8. ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____.
10. ☐ Other: _____.


Rabon Sergeant
Primary Examiner
Art Unit: 1711

Continuation of 2. : The proposed amendment introduces subject matter that has not been previously claimed; therefore, the amendment raises new issues that would require further consideration. Furthermore, the proposed amendment raises the issue of new matter that would require further consideration.

Continuation of 5. : Applicants' response has been considered; however, the rejections have been maintained for the reasons set forth within the final Office action and in view of the fact that the response is based on proposed amendments that will not be entered. Furthermore, despite applicants' remarks with respect to the prior art rejection, the examiner has not simply ignored the "uniform thickness" language of claims 50 and 61; this claim language was addressed within paragraph 5 of the final Office action. Additionally, with respect to the rejection set forth within paragraph 9 of the final Office action, support for the language pertaining to "uniform thickness" has not been found within the cited area of the specification, and despite applicants' argument, the language of original claims 1 and 9 does not provide support for the claimed sequence of layers of claim 80. With respect to the rejections set forth within paragraphs 10 and 11 of the final Office action, the position is maintained that the specification lacks definition and enablement with respect to the language regarding the "adjustable etching component"; applicants' argument is insufficient to establish that the specification provides support for the characteristic of the etching component being adjustable and fails to establish that enablement exists for adjusting the etching component.


RABON SERGENT
PRIMARY EXAMINER